

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/643, 948 08/23/00 YASUFUKU

K 2423-6

022204 MM91/1220
NIXON PEABODY, LLP
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE
SUITE 800
MCLEAN VA 22102

EXAMINER

FIGUEROA, F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2833

DATE MAILED:

12/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/643,948	YASUFUKU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Felix O. Figueroa	2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 August 2000 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
17) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the Brief description of the Drawings, page 6 lines 19 and 20, "which is in the state of Fig. 3," should be changed to --which is in the state of Fig. 4A,--. Note: the application does not have a Fig. 3.

In addition, it is unclear how a section plane can face can face both the front and the rear. See page 6 lines 20 and 23, page 7 line13, etc.

In page 6 line 23, "a place" should be --a plane--.

Figure 11 does not appear to be taken along the plane described in page 7 lines 4 and 5.

Appropriate correction is required.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the contacting part provide with a heat sink as claimed in claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 18 and 19. The specification discloses the use of a contacting part or a heat sink but not the combination of both.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because in Figs. 1, 2, 3B and 4B lead line for "225" is pointing to the beam instead of the window as described in the specification. Correction is required.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the contacting part provided with a heat sink as claimed in claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 18 and 19. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The term "approximately" in claim 1 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "approximately" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the front side" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the connection position" in 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the rear face" in lines 8 and 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the direction of insertion/withdrawal" in lines 11 and 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the left and right sides and the bottom" in 15 and
16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the front-rear direction" in 3. There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "said window" in line 2. There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the shielding function" in line 3. There is
insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the front-rear direction" in 3. There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "said window" in 2. There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 11 and 13 recite the limitation "the shielding function" in line 3. There is
insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the front-rear direction" in 3. There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "said window" in 2. There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 9, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tondreault (US 5,769,668) in view of Hopfer et al. (US 5,761,036).

Tondreault discloses a connector body (10) having a receiving part (14) having a contact (20) provided in a groove, a supporting part (24,26) which extends rearward from the receiving part and a positioning mechanism (28,30) to hold a module in a forward-rearward direction. However Tondreault does not disclose a metallic cover which engages with the connector body to sandwich a module inbetween. Hopfer teaches the use of a hinged, removable, metallic cover, to keep a module in place. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a cover as taught by Hopfer to keep the module from moving from the connecting position.

Claims 5, 6, 10, 11, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tondreault and Hopfer et al. as applied to claims 4, 9 and 15 above, and further in view of Scheingold et al. (US 3,877,064).

Scheingold teaches the use of a cover (28) having a window (19) and a heat sink (68) in the window covering a conductive member (62) to dissipate the heat from the conductive member. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a heat sink covering a conductive member as taught by Scheingold to perform a heat dissipation function.

Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tondreault and Hopfer et al. as applied to claims 4, 9 and 15 above, and further in view of Buller et al. (US 4,978,638).

Buller teaches the use of a contacting part (14) to transfer the thermal energy to a heat sink. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a contacting part as taught by Buller to transfer the thermal energy to the heat sink.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felix O. Figueroa whose telephone number is (703) 308-0097. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

ffr

December 13, 2000



RENEE LUEBKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER